



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/056,623

01/28/2002

Gary E. Rehm

MSE #2620

9413

28524

7590

07/11/2008

SIEMENS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

RAMILLANO, LORE JANET

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1797

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/056,623 | Applicant(s) REHM, GARY E. | |
| | Examiner LORE RAMILLANO | Art Unit 1797 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) LORE RAMILLANO.

(3) Richard Sampson.

(2) Noam Pollack.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 08 July 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 8, and 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: Howard '341 and Corey.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Sampson and Pollack provided an overview of the claimed invention. Both argued that the above cited prior art did not teach the "misidentification," step as recited in the preamble of claims 1 and 8. In addition, both proposed amending the claims to further clarify the claimed invention. Examiner will consider the arguments and proposed claim amendments presented by applicant's representatives.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Jill Warden/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required